

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated November 3, 2006 and the Advisory Action dated February 27, 2007 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 67 and 70 are hereby amended. Claims 1 and 2 were previously canceled. Claims 24-66 were previously withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 3-23 and 67-70 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 3, 6-8, 10-13, 16, 21 and 67-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,358,131 to Sakurai et al. (hereinafter "Sakurai"). Applicant traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that Sakurai does not teach every element recited in independent claims 67 and 70.

Claim 67 recites a system for polishing objects comprising, inter alia, "a first transfer robot located outside the polishing unit;" and "a second transfer robot located outside the polishing unit, the first transfer robot configured to transfer one of said objects to a polisher in the polishing unit, the second transfer robot being configured to transfer another of said objects to a polisher in the polishing unit...."

More specifically, Sakurai fails to disclose at least a "polishing unit," "a first transfer robot located outside the polishing unit" and "a second transfer robot located outside the polishing unit," as recited in the claims. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states these limitations were not previously recited in the claims. Applicant herein amends the claims to recite this feature. On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner interprets carrier 14 as a first transfer robot and another carrier 14 as a second transfer robot. However, Sakurai discloses carriers 14 are present within the polishing chamber 10B. See Figures 1 and 2 of Sakurai. In the

present invention, both transfer robots are “located outside the polishing unit” and transfer objects to the polishing unit. See Figure 1 of the present invention. That is, the transfer robots of the present invention are not located within the polishing unit.

Accordingly, claim 67 is patentable over Sakurai. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claims 3, 6-8, 10-13, 16, 21, 68 and 69, which variously depend from claim 67, are also patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

Claim 70 recites a system for polishing surfaces of semi-conductor wafers comprising, inter alia, “a first transfer robot located outside the polishing unit;” and “a second transfer robot located outside the polishing unit, the first transfer robot and the second transfer robot both being configured to transfer semi-conductor wafers to a polisher in the polishing unit.”

As previously discussed, Sakurai fails to disclose at least “a first transfer robot located outside the polishing unit” and “a second transfer robot located outside the polishing unit,” as recited in the claim. Thus, claim 70 is patentable over Sakurai. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 17-20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,503,365 to Kim et al. (hereinafter “Kim”). Applicant traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicant submits that Sakurai and Kim, taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 17-20 and 23.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kim fails to cure the aforementioned defects associated with the teachings of Sakurai. None of the cited references, singly or in combination,

teaches or suggests “a first transfer robot located outside the polishing unit” and “a second transfer robot located outside the polishing unit,” as recited in independent claim 67. For at least this reason, claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 17-20 and 23, which variously depend from claim 67, are patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, claims 9 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,203 to Wang (hereinafter “Wang”). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that Wang fails to cure the aforementioned defects associated with the teachings of Sakurai. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests “a first transfer robot located outside the polishing unit” and “a second transfer robot located outside the polishing unit,” as recited in independent claim 67. For at least this reason, claims 9 and 22, which variously depend from claim 67, are patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael H. Angert (Reg. No. 46,522)  
for Mark R. Kresloff  
Registration No.: 42,766  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant